DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 894 UD 017 038

AUTHOR Loveless, Eugene J.
TITLE Impact Models for Guidance, School Year 1974-1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 28p.; Document not available in hard copy due to print quality of the original document; New York City Board of Education Function Number 09-53601

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Behavioral Objectives; Community Agencies (Public); Community Involvement; Discipline; Elementary School Counselors; *Elementary Secondary Education; *Guidance Personnel; *Guidance Services; Junior High Schools; Parent School Relationship; Personality Assessment; Program Evaluation; *Reading Improvement; Secondary School Counselors; *Student Improvement; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the program evaluated in this report was to investigate the impact of increased guidance service on the educational performance of children. In this second year of the program; funded under the Elementary Secondary Education Act, Title III, all students in two elementary schools, one intermediate school, a junior high school, and a cluster school consisting of three elementary schools and an intermediate school were included. The objectives of the program were to enhance reading achievement, and to reduce the number of unruly disruptions in the classrooms, and to reduce the number of disruptive incidents in the classrooms, and in the schools at large. The activities of the counselors included screening for learning problems, group and individual counseling, tutorial assistance, and inservice meeting with teachers. Counselors also met with parents, contacted helping agencies when needed, and enlisted parental support in many of their activities. Reading tests, principals' records, and teacher ratings of students were used to evaluate the goals of the program. The major finding of the study was that reading improved for the fourth through ninth grades. Second grade reading scores did not significantly improve. There was slight improvement in teacher student ratings and unruly class and school disruptions. An appendix with some of the data used in the study is included. (JP)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED139894

Function No. 09-53601

IMPACT MODELS FOR GUIDANCE

School Year 1974-1975

Eugene J. Loveless, Ph. D.
Consultant - Evaluator

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P L 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

CG017038

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Chapter I	Description of the Program	4
Chapter II	Evaluative Procedures	6
Chapter III	Findings	8
Chapter IV	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	15
Chapter V	Exemplary Program Abstract	17
Appendix A	Description of the Non-Standardized Evaluation Instruments Utilized in the Study	18
Appendix B	Data Loss Form	20
Appendix C	Mailed Information Report	24

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Standardized Reading Test Results	12
Table 2	Untoward Incidents	13
Table 3	Behavior Ratings	14

Chapter I Description of the Program

The purpose of this program was to investigate the impact of increased guidance service on the educational performance of children. Five widely separated schools volunteered for the program and received two funded counselors in addition to two tax levy counselors in order to implement the program. The objectives of the program are to (1) enhance the academic achievement of the pupils in the program, particularly reading achievement, (2) to reduce the frequency of undesirable classroom behavior, and (3) to reduce the number of untoward incidents in the school at large. The role of the counselors was to identify pupils with special needs, provide ancillary instructional support to pupils, and work with the classroom teachers towards achieving these goals.

Each school developed its own program under its own initiative in order to adapt the program to the local needs of its own pupils Schools differed according to grade organization. The program included two elementary schools, one intermediate school, a junior high school, and a cluster school consisting of three elementary schools and an intermediate school.

The activities of the counselors included screening for learning problems, group and individual counseling, tutorial assistance and in-service meetings with teachers. In addition, counselors met with parents, contacted helping agencies when needed and conducted activities involving parents to enlist support for the program.

All the children in each school were included. The strategy of the program was to increase the support, contact, and service to the children. This strategy was intended to result in increased academic achievement, particularly reading, and increased classroom cooperation for the pupils of the guidance improved schools.

This was the second year of the program. The initial year was devoted to introducing and establishing the program. This year was expected to capitalize upon the experiences gained from last year's efforts in adapting the program to each school.

Chapter II Evaluative Procedures

One objective of the project was to determine if guidance improved schools demonstrated significant gains on the citywide reading tests. After a full school year's instruction (10 months), a historical regression analysis was conducted on the citywide test results of 1974 and 1975. The Reading Comprehension subtests administered on both testing occasions were equated by means of tables prepared by the Office of Educational Evaluation (to equate the Metropolitan Achievement Tests of 1974 with the new tests of 1975. The test scores were then statistically analyzed. The objective was to include all participants but only pupils with complete scores from both testing sessions were included. As a result the project schools which had extremely high turnover (up to eighty per cent of the registered pupils in one school) had fewer pupils than intended for the analysis. The missing scores are described on the data loss form in the appendix. The relatively low percentage of scores avilable for analysis is due to the pupils' entering and leaving the shcool district during the year.

The second objective of the program was to determine if the project efforts resulted in fewer incidences of assaults, vandalism, drug abuse, suspension and arrests. These data were readily available from the principals' records in each school based on the end of the year totals. In addition, attendance data were obtained from school records.

The third objective was to determine if there was a positive gain

in the teachers' ratings of pupil behavior. The measure of this objective was the decrease in the number of unsatisfactory ratings assigned by teachers to their pupils. Teacher ratings for the third quarter of 1974 and 1975 were compared with a Chi Square analysis.

The fourth objective was to determine the extent to which the project reached its goals. This objective was implemented by site visits, observations and interviews with the staff at each school.

Chapter III Findings

Research objective #1. This objective was to determine if pupils in guidance improved schools demonstrate statistically significant gains in reading grade score equivalents over a period of one academic year (10 months).

The findings (found in Table 1) indicate that the program substantially attained its first objective. Table 1 indicates that almost all of the grades attained statistically significant gains on the reading tests. In almost every case a high level of probability was attained especially in the upper grades.

The result for the fourth grade was significant at the .05 level of probability while the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth grade results all met or exceeded the .01 level of significance. The third grade failed to achieve statisically significant gains in the reading tests.

Research objective #2. This objective was to determine if guidance improved schools demonstrated significant decreases in assaults, vandalism, drug abuses, suspensions, arrests and, as an added item absentee levels. The original design called for an analysis by grade level, but the incidence was so low it was decided to pool the data for all the grades and schools.

The results by school in Table 2 indicate that there was a slight numerical improvement over last year in all areas with the exception of

vandalism which held constant. The positive gains in direction in most cases suggests a minimum tendency of the program toward fulfilling this objective.

Research objective #3. This objective was to determine if guidance improved schools demonstrate significant gains in character and personality ratings. In this objective the number of unsatisfactory ratings of classroom behavior provided by the teacher was compared for each grade level for this year and last year apparently for the third quarter only). The results are reported in Table 3. The results in each case indicate substantial improvement in the direction of an attainment of the objective. However, they were not statistically significant gains.

Research objective #4. This objective is based on a determination of the extent that the research proposal was actually carried out. Following last year's initial effort and the suggestions that the program close the gap between the activities of the counselors and the objectives of the proposal many changes took place. This year found heavy interest in identifying learning disabled children and high risk learners and providing them with supplementary aids. As teachers became more familiar with the objectives of the program their cooperation increased. The gains in reading may perhaps be attributed to interest in and acceptance of the program in its second year.

The program touched all the children in the Schools. The net result was that some children who were ineligible for Title I services benefited from the program. This was unavoidable from the start and an obvious flaw in the original proposal. Most of the children singled out for special attention were from the Title I target population. The activities included in the program were individual counseling, group counseling, screening for emotional and scholastic disabilities, social services, referrals, parent counseling, community involvement, and teacher orientation.

Parent and Community involvement was high. These activities included meetings for parental orientation to the program, home visits, contacts with social agencies, and in one school (Richmond Cluster) a program of pre-vocational work experience in local shops. Each counselor had a large number of individual contacts. They dealt with problems in learning, adjustment, vocational choice, and the selection of high schools for junior high school pupils.

There was some difficulty in acquiring adequate materials since the orders were usually delayed in delivery for long periods of time after being requested. Administrative support was excellent and the Supervisory Staff provided direction and substantial in-service training (including several work shops) as part of the program.

All the schools that participated last year continued this year. There were some Staff changes at the expense of the continuity of the

program. Local administrative problems in two schools (P.S. 191K, and [illegible]) delayed staffing the schools in full at the outset. This was a temporary difficulty however, and the delay was brief.

The objectives of the program were substantially carried out. The program was capably administered and implemented. The staff was actively initiating new activities and provided services to a large number of pupils. They involved a large number of pupils, parents, and community agencies in their program. Heavy emphasis was placed on enhancing scholastic achievement particularly reading. The experience gained from last year resulted in a better articulation of the program and the research objectives.

45B. Standardized Test Results (Reading Tests) Table 1

In the table below, please enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Attach additional sheets if necessary. Before completing this question, read all footnotes.

nt	Activity Code	Objective Code	Test Used (MAT, CAT, etc.)	Form	Level	Total N 1/	2/ Group ID	Sample Size	3/ Y	3/ N	Pretest Date	Pretest 4/ Mean	5/ Predicted Posttest Mean 4/	Actual Posttest Date	Actual Posttest 4/ Mean	Statistical Data 6/ 7/ df	Stat Test Used	Stat Test Obtained Value	Specify Level of significance Obtained (e.g. p≤.05; ≤.0
08 13	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	El.	500	Gr. 3	388	Y		4-74	3.84	4.03	4-75	3.72	387	t	-1.15	Not significant
08 14	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	El.	800	Gr. 4	568	Y		4-74	3.63	4.58	4-75	5.01	567	t	2.22	P≤.05
08 14	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	Int.	800	Gr. 5	611	Y		4-74	4.48	5.57	4-75	6.59	610	t	4.28	P≤.01
08 14	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	Int.	800	Gr. 6	595	Y		4-74	6.61	7.39	4-75	8.07	594	t	5.26	P≤.01
08 15	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	Adv.	300	Gr. 7	243	Y		4-74	6.99	7.79	4-75	7.96	211	t	7.68	P≤.01
08 15	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	Adv.	300	Gr. 8	209	Y		4-74	7.45	8.15	4-75	8.53	208	t	3.31	P≤.01
08 15	711	801	MAT 71 NYC 75	-G	Adv.	300	Gr. 9	188	Y		4-74	8.27	9.31	4-75	9.87	187	t	3.65	P≤.01

tal N (total number). Indicate the total number of participants in the component.
oup I.D. (group identification). Indicate group, e.g. grade 5; grade 3 control; grade 3 treatment (a control group nsists of students selected at the same time that treatment participants were selected and who essentially have the ne characteristics as the treatment group. The control group does not take part in the compensatory activity, whereas treatment group does.)
(yes/no) Is sample representative of universe? Check Y (yes) or N (no).
n. Use grade equivalents unless unavailable from publisher's norms. Specify type of mean used.
dicted posttest. Use only for correlated samples using "historical" regression procedure.
tistical data. Use test of significance for actual posttest v. predicted posttest where correlated samples are used.
. (degrees of freedom). Indicate degrees of freedom used in analysis.
t used and value (e.g., t=3.85, F=4.17, etc.). Scores for the same individuals should be included in pre and ttest calculations.

Table 2

Untoward Incidents in the Impact Schools 1974-1975

	All Schools
Vandalism	
1975	11
1974	11
	Chi Square = .00
	P = Not Significant
Assault	
1975	3
1974	7
	Chi Square = 4.57
	*P = Not Significant
Attendance	
1975	89.8
1974	88.5
	Chi Square = 2.11
	P = Not Significant
Drug Abuse	
1975	0
1974	1
	Chi Square = 1.05
	*P = Not Significant
Suspensions	
1975	144
1974	156
	Chi Square = 14.40
	P = Not Significant
Arrests	
1975	4
1974	6
	Chi Square = 6.18
	*P = Not Significant

*Chi-Square analysis involving cells with less than five members were corrected for continuity (C. F. McNemar, P. 262, Psychological Statistics, fourth edition, Wiley, 1969).

Table 3

Number of Unsatisfactory Behavior Ratings
in the Impact Schools by Grade Level

Grade	Year	U's	Direction of Change	Chi Square	P Value
3	1975	23	+	1.40	Not Significant
	1974	35			
4	1975	57	+	0.24	Not Significant
	1974	62			
5	1975	83	+	10.13	Not Significant
	1974	112			
6	1975	72	+	10.88	Not Significant
	1974	98			
7	1975	85	+	10.59	Not Significant
	1974	115			
8	1975	47	+	27.57	Not Significant
	1974	93			

Chapter IV Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluation indicates the attainment of the objectives of the program. In particular the statistical evidence that the reading scores of the children were raised as a result of the program was the major finding and a central objective of the program. This indicates that the benefits of last year's introduction of the program were now apparent. The results of last year's exploratory effort and the changes in the activities of the counselors towards more instructionally centered goals was apparently effective. The changes were made to reflect the suggestions in last year's report that counselors focus on reading and learning disabilities as well as social adjustment goals.

The behavioral objectives were also attained by the program although not as strongly as the reading objective and not to statistical levels of significance. The continued improvement of pupil performance on the second and third objective may reflect the increasing cooperation between the counselors and teachers and suggests program influence.

The improvements that were included in this year's program reflect the suggestions of last year's report, and the greater integration of the counselors' work with the objectives of the program and the increased cooperation of the classroom teachers with the program. In particular, the cooperation of the teachers and counselors increased substantially in identifying, counseling, and providing adapted instructional settings for children with learning disabilities and adjustment problems. The acceptance and support of the program seemed to have improved as the teachers got to

know the new counselors and felt the benefits of an additional resource at their disposal to assist them.

Next year's project should continue to expand the role of the counselors in supporting the instructional activities of the teachers. Even greater effort and interest in identifying learning disabled and high risk pupils can be extended. Further follow up to insure that sufficient remedial services are provided would be helpful. It is also suggested that every effort be made to retain the same people in each school to maintain the program.

It seems very important that the project be continued to take advantage of its growing influence in pupil success. Following the modest success of last year, this year's showing is impressive. Much of this success seems attributable to the continuity of the program. It would appear that at least two years are necessary for a program of this type to become productive. Future attempts should be made to evaluate the impact of this program on special subgroups of children such as the learning disabled who are now receiving attention due to the efforts of this project.

Chapter V Exemplary Program Abstract

Project Impact was designed to enhance pupil scholastic achievement and school adjustment by increasing the number of guidance counselors in the six schools of the project. This was the second year of this program. The test results yielded significant gains in reading scores for the fourth grade ($P < .05$) and for the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth grades ($P < .01$). The results for the second grade gains in reading did not reach a significant level of probability. The gains in meeting the objectives concerned with reducing untoward incidents in the school and reducing the number of unsatisfactory ratings by teachers were in the desired direction but not statistically significant.

The improved performance of the children of the project Impact schools on the reading tests and on the behavioral objectives seemed attributable to the efforts of this program. It would seem that there was a beneficial effect gained from the continuity of the program staff over two years. This resulted in an apparent increase in the cooperation between the teachers and counselors as a function of greater familiarity with the program's objectives and with the contribution of each professional specialty.

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
6 5 4 1 7	7 0 4	8 0 7	30

Brief Description Official data from the guidance improved schools were collected from the principals' records for incidents of (1) assaults (2) vandalism (3) drug abuse (4) suspensions (5) arrests (6) attendance during the current year.

Number of cases observed: 3 3 0 0 Number of cases in treatment: 3 3 0 0

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): Incidents reported by the Principal on his annual report for the past year (1973-1974).

Criterion of success: Significant differences between incidents of 1973 and 1974 school years.

Was objective fully met? Yes [ ] No [X] If yes, by what criteria do you know? See Table 2

Comments: While several categories showed slight changes in the positive direction, they did not reach levels of statistical significance.

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

21. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
6 5 4 1 7	7 0 7	8 0 7	30

Brief Description Ratings of student behavior were collected by the principals for each student. The total number of unsatisfactory ratings for each grade level for all of the schools were tabulated and examined by a Chi Square analysis. The number of unsatisfactory ratings was the pertinent variable in each analysis.

Number of cases observed: 3 8 0 0 Number of cases in treatment: 3 8 0 0

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): The number of unsatisfactory ratings for the same period of the previous school year (Third quarter of the school year).

Criterion of success: A Chi Square analysis was performed to ascertain whether the results were statistically significant.

Was objective fully met? Yes [ ] No [X] If yes, by what criteria do you know? See Table 3

Comments: Although all the grades showed decreases in the frequency of unsatisfactory ratings the results were not statistically significant.

Appendix B

Data Loss Form

The total number of children in the Impact Models for Guidance Program was 3,800. This is the number of pupils in the Impact Schools both last year (1973-1974) and the present year (1974-1975). The number of children reported on was 2,802. The difference between the numbers is due to:

a) Incomplete records (i.e. children moved, transferred or graduated to or from another school) N = 676

b) Absences (i.e. test results were not available for both test administrations) N = 312

c) Children were exempted from the tests due to behavior problems, emotional disturbance or severe language disabilities. N = 10

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 035880

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
8 0 8 1 3	7 1 1	Gr.3	NYC 75	500	388	112	.224	Moved or transferred in or out	84
								absent (38), exempt (5)	43
8 0 8 1 4	7 1 1	Gr.4	NYC 75	800	568	232	.290	Moved or transferred	117
								absent (110), exempt (5)	115
8 0 8 1 4	7 1 1	Gr.5	NYC 75	800	611	189	.236	Moved or transferred	123
								absent	66
8 0 8 1 [illegible]	[illegible]	Gr.6	NYC 75	800	606	194	.242	Moved or transferred	[illegible]
								absent	94
8 0 8 1 4	[illegible]	Gr.7	NYC 75	800	246	97	.120	Moved or transferred	28
								absent	84

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on Item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

Appendix B (Continued)

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 0953601

Impact Models for Guidance 1974-1975

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 5	7 1 1	Gr. 8	NYC 75	300	209	91	.303	Moved, transferred or withdrew	23
								absent	68
6 0 8 1 5	7 1 1	Gr. 9	NYC 75	300	188	112	.290	Moved, transferred or withdrew	45
								absent	67

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separat number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

32. Program Abstract: Please provide an abstract of your project, including aspects of the project which account for highly positive results. Provide a summary of the findings in relation to the objectives, as well as a description of the pedagogical methodology employed.

33. Date activities began 9 / 5 /74 (Mo. Day Yr.) Date activities will terminate 6 /30 /75 (Mo. Day Yr.)

34. Project time span (check one): 1|☐| School Year 2|☐| Summer 3|☐| 12 Mos. 4|X| More than 1 year

35. Project is: 1|☐| New 2|☐| Resubmitted 3|X| Continuation (Title III only)

A. If project is resubmitted, please indicate number of years operated:

|X| 2 years |☐| 4 years

|☐| 3 years |☐| 5 or more years

Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION III

1974-75 School Year

Due Date: July 15, 1975

SED Project Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only) | 0 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 |

Project Title Impact Models for Guidance

School District Name Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Eugene J. Loveless Ph.D.

Title Consultant - Evaluator

Telephone Number 914 (Area Code) 793-1274

Date this form was completed August / 28 / 1975